

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/788,840	02/27/2004	John M. Kokosa	KJD-100-A 6903 EXAMINER		
22825	7590 03/03/2006				
. WILLIAM M HANLON, JR YOUNG & BASILE, PC			BELLAMY, TAMIKO D		
	BIG BEAVER ROAD	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 624	•		2856		
TROY, MI	48084-3107		DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7/
62

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/788,840	KOKOSA, JOHN	M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tamiko D. Bellamy	2856					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status	·						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Fe</u>	ebruary 2006.						
,— ,	action is non-final.						
<i>,</i> —	·						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>2/6/06</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority document		an Na					
2. Certified copies of the priority document			Stogo				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in unis ivadoriai	Stage				
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	nd .					
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	.u.					
Attachment(s)	» □	(DTO 445)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Informal P		O-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/31/04	6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 2/6/06. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lightner et al. (3,508,442) in view of Rasmussen et al. (WO9725606A1).

Re claims 1 and 8, Lightner et al. discloses controlling movement (e.g., combination of prime movers A, B, C) of a syringe (18) in multiple axes (Col. 7, lines 16, 17; Col. 8, lines 9-15, 51-58). Lightner et al. discloses cleaning the syringe (Col. 8, lines 40-45). Lightner et al discloses moving the syringe (18) to a sample vial (142), inserting a tip of the syringe (18) to into the sample vial (142), collecting a portion of the sample in the syringe (18), withdrawing the syringe from the sample vial, and moving the syringe to an instrument injector (10) (Col. 7, lines 15-20). Lightner et al. discloses injecting the sample into the instrument injector for analysis of the sample, and repeating the prior steps on each of the plurality of samples (Col. 7, lines 15-27). Lightner et al. do not specifically disclose drawing a carrier solvent into the syringe. Rasmussen et al.

Page 3

discloses drawing a carrier solvent into the syringe (Pg. 4, lines 14-37; Pg. 5, lines 1-9). Therefore, to modify Lightner et al by employing drawing a carrier solvent into the syringe would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since Rasmussen et al. teaches a sampling device having theses design characteristics. The skilled artisan would be motivated to combine the teachings of Lightner et al. and Rasmussen et al. since Lightner et al. states that his invention is applicable to automated liquid sampler for gas chromatograph and Rasmussen et al. is directed to liquid microextraction of an sample and transferring the sample to a injection port of an analytical instrument/GC.

Re claim 2, Lightner et al. discloses withdrawing a portion of a sample and injecting the sample into an injection port. Lightner et al. lacks the detail of expelling and holding a microdrop of solvent on the tip of the syringe for a period of time to collect the sample, and drawing the microdrop and the colleted portion of the sample into the syringe. Rasmussen et al. discloses expelling and holding a microdrop of solvent on the tip of the syringe for a period of time to collect the sample, and drawing the microdrop and the colleted portion of the sample into the syringe (Pg. 4, lines 14-37; Pg. 5, lines 1-9; Pg. 7, lines 24-37). Therefore, to modify Lightner et al by employing expelling and holding a microdrop of solvent on the tip of the syringe for a period of time to collect the sample would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since Rasmussen et al. teaches a sampling device having theses design characteristics. The skilled artisan would be motivated to combine the teachings of Lightner et al. and Rasmussen et al. since Lightner et al. states that his invention is

Application/Control Number: 10/788,840 Page 4

Art Unit: 2856

applicable to automated liquid sampler for gas chromatography and Rasmussen et al. is directed to liquid microextraction of an sample and transferring the sample to a injection port of an analytical instrument/GC.

Re claim 3, as depicted in fig. 6, Lightner et al. discloses a placing a plurality of sample vials (142) in a holder in established coordinate positions

Re claim 4, Lightner et al. discloses providing a cleaning solution in a known coordinate position (Col. 8, lines 40-45).

Re claim 5, Lightner et al. discloses moving the syringe to the cleaning vial, and withdrawing contents of the cleaning solution into the syringe (Col. 7, lines 60-64, Col. 8, lines 40-45).

Re claim 6, as depicted in fig. 6, Lightner et al. discloses inserting the syringe (18) into the sample vial (142) to position the tip of the syringe (18) in a head space above a liquid sample in the vial (142).

Re claim 7, as depicted in fig. 6, Lightner et al. discloses inserting the syringe tip of the syringe (18) into the sample vial (142).

Response to Remarks

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is the examiners position that claims 1-8 are not patentable in view of the newly applied art of Lightner et al. (3,508,442) in view of Rasmussen et al. (WO9725606A1).

Application/Control Number: 10/788,840 Page 5

Art Unit: 2856

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamiko D. Bellamy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tamiko Bellamy

February 23, 2006

HEZHUN WILLIAMS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800